

The Columbus Democrat.

H. H. WORTHINGTON, Editor.

[A STRICT ADHERENCE TO THE LETTER AND SPIRIT OF THE CONSTITUTION—THE ONLY SAFEGUARD OF THE SOUTH.]

W. H. WORTHINGTON, Publisher.

VOL. XVII.

COLUMBUS, MISSISSIPPI, SATURDAY, JULY 3, 1852.

NO. 51.

THE DEMOCRAT.

IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING, BY
H. H. WORTHINGTON & SON.

Office—South Side of Main Street, one door west
of the Eclipse Literary Stable, Columbus, Miss.

TERMS.

For the paper, Three dollars per annum in advance; Four dollars if payment is delayed till the end of the year.

No paper discontinued, except at the option of the publisher, until all arrearages are paid.

Advertisements, at the regular charge, will be on dollar a square of ten lines or less, for the first insertion, and fifty cents for each subsequent one.

Advertisements by the year will be contracted with on liberal terms.

Legal advertisements full rates.

Yearly advertisements payable semi-annually in advance.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

OF THE LIFE AND SERVICES OF

GENERAL FRANKLIN PIERCE

Democratic Nominee for President.

GEN. FRANKLIN PIERCE, the present Democratic candidate for President, whose nomination was so unanimous and enthusiastic, is the son of an old revolutionary soldier. His father's name was Benjamin Pierce. He is represented to have been a true type of that race of heroes who lived in the "times that tried men's souls." He was an honest, plain, blunt man, of sterling common sense, and unflinching patriotism. He is represented to have been a highly educated man—as few, indeed, were in those early days of our country, when the means of education were so limited, and when the duties that devolved even upon the young were exacting. Benjamin Pierce, however, made up in native strength of character and goodness of heart, what he lacked of the discipline of the school and the polish of the academy. He volunteered as a private soldier in the revolutionary struggle, through the entire course of which he fought with that ardor and devotion which was the peculiar characteristic of our revolutionary sires. It is enough to say of him, however, in this connection that he was one of that Spartan band which fought on Bunker Hill, the first great battle for our freedom. After the war of the revolution was over, he enjoyed in his native State, the esteem of his fellow-citizens—was elected to offices of trust and honor, and finally was elected Governor of the State in 1827 and again in 1829. Many are the anecdotes told illustrative of the gallant old man. They all prove him to be remarkable for his native strength of mind, his public and private virtues, and his whole-hearted devotion to the cause of American liberty.

From such a man, the present Democratic candidate is descended, and all who know him are free to admit that he is a worthy son of such a father. FRANK PIERCE was born in the town of Hillsborough, N. H., in 1804, and is consequently about 48 years of age. In the same vicinity, Lewis Cass, Daniel Webster, and other great men of the country, first saw the light. He received a classical education, and was brought up to the legal profession, in which he soon became eminent, and of which he has been, for many years, the chief ornament in his native State. At a very early period of life, Gen. Pierce attracted the attention, and secured the esteem and confidence of his fellow citizens, who were not slow in bestowing upon him marks of favor. When very young, he was elected to the Legislature of New Hampshire, and when only twenty-seven years of age, he was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives, a position which he filled with dignity, firmness and courtesy, unusual in one of his age.

After serving several sessions in the Legislature of his State, he was elected to the lower house of Congress in 1833, and again in 1835. In 1837, while a member of the House, he was elected to the Senate of the United States, being then about thirty-three years of age, and held a seat in that exalted body until 1842, when he resigned, and returned to the practice of his profession. The Congressional course of General Pierce was one of usefulness to his country, and honor to himself, and he shall be remembered for dwelling upon it at some length. When he first entered Congress, his political opinions were firm and decided, and he consistently adhered to them under the most trying circumstances. His record is one to which we proudly refer, as that of a man national in all his sentiments, and patriotic in all his views. Gen. Pierce's uniform and consistent course while in Congress, upon all questions in which the constitutional rights of the South were involved, is worthy of the highest admiration, and certain, wherever known, to endear him to the hearts of the Southern people.

Those familiar with the political history of that period, will remember that the first session of the 24th Congress (1835-6) was a most trying time with the friends of the South. From all sections of the North, petitions were sent for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. These petitions, it is true, were mostly signed by women and children, but the question of their reception and reference became of great importance, and produced the most excited feelings. John Quincy Adams and his coadjutors were the channels through which these incendiary papers were poured into Congress, and these men, on every occasion, battled for their reception and reference to committees. Against them stood arrayed the South and the friends of the South, and although then, as now, a large majority was opposed to the disorganizing efforts of the abolitionists, the contest was long and exciting.

At this eventful period, Gen. Pierce was in Congress, and from the first took high and patriotic ground on the subject. Every vote given by him upon this exciting subject, identified him with the friends of the South, and called down upon him the curses, loud and deep, of Northern fanatics. We have before us an abolition publication in which he is grossly assailed for declaring that his constituents were opposed to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. These assaults, however, moved him not. The

first abolition petition presented after he had taken his seat, he voted to lay on the table.

On the 18th of Dec. 1835, Gen. Pierce took occasion formally to define his position upon the subject of abolition petitions. A petition for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia was then before the House. General Pierce said:

"This was not the last memorial of the same character which would be sent here. It was perfectly apparent that the question must be met now, or at some future time, fully and explicitly, and such an expression of this House given, as could leave no possible room to doubt as to the opinions and sentiments entertained by its members."

"He was unwilling that any imputation should rest upon the North, in consequence of the misguided and fanatical zeal of a few comparatively few—who, however honest might have been their purposes, he believed had done incalculable mischief, and whose movements he knew received no more sanction among the great mass of the people of the North than they did at the South."

"For one, he [Mr. P.] while he would be the last to infringe on any of the sacred reserved rights of the people, was prepared to stamp with disapprobation, in the most express and unequivocal terms the whole movement upon this subject."

Gen. Pierce further said:

"He felt confidence in asserting that among the people of the State which he had the honor in part to represent, there was not one in a hundred who did not entertain the most sacred regard for the rights of Southern brethren—may, not one in five hundred who would not have their rights protected at any and every hazard. There was not the slightest disposition to interfere with any of the rights secured by the constitution, which binds together, and which he humbly hoped would bind together, this great and glorious confederacy as one family."

On the motion to lay said petition on the table, Gen. Pierce said:

"If the motion to lay on the table be persisted in, he would vote for it, though he would prefer to meet the question in some form which could by no possibility be considered either equivocal or evasive."

On the 10th of February, 1836, Gen. Pierce was appointed one of a select committee on the subject of abolition petitions, of which Mr. Pickens, of South Carolina, was chairman. On the 18th of May, 1836, said committee made a unanimous report, submitting the following resolution to the House:

Resolved, That Congress possesses no constitutional power to interfere in any way with the institution of slavery in any of the States of this confederacy.

Resolved, That Congress ought not to interfere in any way with slavery in the District of Columbia.

And whereas, It is extremely important and desirable that the agitation of this subject should be finally arrested for the purpose of restoring tranquility to the public mind, your committee respectfully recommend the adoption of the following additional resolution, viz:

Resolved, That all petitions, memorials, resolutions, propositions or papers, relating in any way, or to any extent whatsoever, to the subject of slavery, or to the abolition of slavery, shall, without being either printed or referred, be laid upon the table, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon.

The vote was taken separately upon these resolutions, and each one passed by a large majority—Gen. Pierce voting in the affirmative upon each one.

In 1837, Gen. Pierce was elected to the Senate of the United States, and on the 18th of December, in that year, he made a speech in which he said:

"As a member of the select committee of the other House, of which Mr. Pickens of South Carolina was chairman, he had fully concurred in the sentiments of the report presented by that gentleman at the first session of the 24th Congress, and further examination and reflection had only served to confirm him in the opinions which he at that time entertained; but, mad and fanatical as he regarded the schemes of the abolitionists, and deeply as he deplored the consequences of their course upon all sections of the Union, he could give no vote that might be construed into a denial of the right of petition, and thus enable them to change their position, and make up a false issue before the country."

In December, 1837, Mr. Calhoun offered a series of resolutions, which were subsequently modified and passed in the following terms.

1. **Resolved**, That in the adoption of the federal constitution, the States adopting the same acted, severally, as free, independent, and sovereign States; and that each, for itself, by its own voluntary assent, entered the Union with the view to its increased security against all dangers, political as well as foreign, and the more perfect and secure enjoyment of its advantages, natural, political and social.

2. **Resolved**, That in delegating a portion of their powers to be exercised by the Federal Government, the States, severally, retained the exclusive and sole right over their own domestic institutions and police to the full extent to which those powers were not thus delegated, and are alone responsible for them; and that any interference of any one or more States, or a combination of their citizens, with the domestic institutions and policy of the others, on any ground, political, moral, or religious, or under any pretext whatever, with the view to their alteration or subversion, is not warranted by the Constitution, tending to endanger the domestic peace and tranquility of the States interfered with, subversive of the objects for which the Constitution was formed, and, by necessary consequence, tending to weaken and destroy the Union itself.

3. **Resolved**, That this Government was instituted and adopted by the several States of this Union, as a common agent, in order to carry into effect the powers which they had delegated by the Constitution for their mutual security; and that in the fulfillment of this high and sacred trust, this Government is bound so to exercise its powers, as not to interfere with the stability and security of the domestic institutions of the States that compose the Union; and that it is the solemn duty of the Government to resist to the extent of its constitutional power, all attempts by one portion of the Union to use it as an instru-

ment to attack the domestic institutions of another, or to weaken or destroy such institutions.

4. **Resolved**, That domestic slavery, as it exists in the Southern and Western States of this Union, composes an important part of their domestic institutions, inherited by their ancestors, and existing at the adoption of the Constitution, by which it is recognized as constituting an important element in the apportionment of powers among the States, and that no change of opinion on the part of the other States of the Union in relation to it, can justify them or their citizens in open and systematic attacks thereon, with the view to its overthrow; and that all such attacks are in manifest violation of the mutual and solemn pledge to protect and defend each other, given by the States respectively, on entering into the constitutional compact which formed the Union, and as such are a manifest breach of faith, and a manifest violation of the most solemn obligations.

5. **Resolved**, That interference by the citizens of any of the States, with the view to the abolition of slavery in this District, is endangering the rights and security of the people of the District; and that any act or measure of Congress designed to abolish slavery in this District, would be a violation of the faith implied in the cessions by the States of Virginia and Maryland, a just cause of alarm to the people of the slaveholding States, and have a direct and inevitable tendency to disturb and endanger the Union.

And Resolved, That any attempt of Congress to abolish slavery in any Territory of the United States in which it exists, would create serious alarm and just apprehension, in the States sustaining that domestic institution; would be a violation of good faith towards the inhabitants of any such Territory who have been permitted to settle with, and hold slaves therein, because the people of any such Territory have not asked for the abolition of slavery therein, and because when any such Territory shall be admitted into the Union as a State, the people thereof will be entitled to decide that question exclusively for themselves.

General Pierce voted in the affirmative upon each and every one of these resolutions, in opposition to Daniel Webster, who was then in the U. S. Senate.

In 1839, Gen. Pierce presented a petition praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, on which occasion he made the following remarks:

"Mr. P. said that the memorial came to him, accompanied by a letter from a highly respectable clergyman, residing in his native country. The letter says, 'though we are aware that your views may not correspond with those of the petitioners, they have no doubt of your readiness to present a respectable petition coming from any portion of the citizens of New Hampshire.'"

It is certainly no task to present the memorial, and yet I cannot, in justice to my own convictions of duty, comply with the request, without expressing my deep regret, that these petitioners, many of whom I am sure are actuated by pure motives, should so far mistake their own moral responsibilities, and the power and duty of Congress in relation to this subject."

I do earnestly hope that every honest man who has sincerely at heart the best interest of the slave and master, may no longer be governed by blind zeal and impulse, but be led to examine this subject, so full of delicacy and danger in all its bearings; and that, when called upon to lead their names and influence to the cause of agitation, they may remember that we live under a written Constitution which is the panoply and protection of the South, as well as the North; that it covers the entire Union, and is equally a guarantee for the unalienable enjoyment of the domestic institutions of all its parts; and, I trust, further, that they no longer close their eyes to the fact that so far as those in whose welfare they express so much feeling are concerned, this FOREIGN INTERFERENCE has been, and must inevitably continue to be, evil, and only evil. Having on a former occasion, expressed my views somewhat at length, I will not detain you further than to notice an erroneous statement which has been made, and a thousand times repeated, with regard to my own course and that of the Representatives of New Hampshire in both Houses of Congress. We have been charged with having denied the right of petition; and although the charge is wholly without foundation, I have no doubt that, from its frequent repetition, it may have had an influence upon the minds of many honest and patriotic men. So far from having denied, we have uniformly asserted and maintained this right. But after declaration and argument had been exhausted on both sides of the question—after the memorials had been referred to a select committee during the 24th Congress, and no elaborate report sent forth to the American people—we thought it our duty to take such a course with petitions of this character, as would enable Congress to proceed with the consideration of subjects of necessary and legitimate legislation. The whole question since that period has been one with regard to the preservation of memorials when received; and no denunciation or false representations will drive us from a course demanded alike by a regard for the proper and necessary legislation of Congress, the rights of the South, and the interests of the whole country. After the declarations which have gone from high sources during the present session, in both ends of the Capitol, I am encouraged to hope that the agitation of this question in New England for political purposes will cease; and that there will be no more attempts to deceive and excite the people, by insinuating the impression that their rights to petition have been invaded."

Such was the course of Gen. Pierce, while in Congress on the subject of slavery, a subject of vital importance then to the South, and of vital importance now. At the present time, indeed, we point to it with peculiar satisfaction. Now, if ever, the safety and peace of the country require that a man and a party should be at the head of affairs whose slavery opinions are firmly settled and national in their character. With this record, and the platform of the National Democratic Convention before us, we can say without fear of contradiction, that the Democratic candidate is such a man, and the Democratic party such a party.

While speaking of the slavery sentiments of Gen. Pierce, it will not be out of place to state that the democracy of N. H., of which he has

for many years been the leading spirit, has ever maintained a national position and frowned upon all attempts to interfere with the institutions and reserved rights of the States. In every crisis through which the country has passed, the New Hampshire democracy have never failed to stand firm for the constitution, its guarantees and its compromises. On two memorable occasions, it has been tried in fire and proved to be pure gold. When John P. Hale attempted to abolishize it, by insisting upon opposition to the annexation of Texas, unless a portion of her territory was secured to free-soilism, Gen. Pierce was active and decided in his hostility to the movement, and was triumphantly sustained by the party. The result was the repudiation of Hale by the democracy, and his affiliation with the whigs and free soilers, by whose aid he has since been elected to the U. S. Senate. Again, during the gubernatorial election of last year, John Atwood, the nominee of the democratic convention in New Hampshire, deserted the well known sentiments of his party, and expressed opinions hostile to the fugitive slave law. No sooner was this movement made, than Gen. Pierce took the stump against it, and by his untiring exertions succeeded in assembling a second convention which repudiated Atwood, and nominated a friend of the compromise. The result was the triumphant election of the second nominee for New Hampshire, otherwise free from all blemish. General Pierce is deserving of especial praise, for his exertions they were undoubtedly the result.

At the time the compromise measures were passed, Gen. Pierce was not in public life, but it is known that he warmly approved of that adjustment as a whole, and has ever since deprecated all opposition to it. While the compromise was under consideration in the Senate, he wrote a letter to a distinguished member of that body, from which we extract the following paragraphs:

"It grieves me to observe that the spirit of concession and honorable compromise is not stronger and more pervading at Washington. I have no apprehension that the disruption of this Union is near at hand; but I foresee consequences appalling in this daily use of the terms 'North' and 'South' as terms of antagonism. What are the North and South but component parts of our common country—parts which should be regarded as absolutely inseparable; not united merely by reciprocal rights and obligations arising under the constitution, but bound together by ties of affection, common interest, and reciprocal respect; recognizing at all times, and above all, that noble band of brothers which concentrated the genius, and courage, and patriotism and achieved our independence, that has sustained the country in all its trials—that bond to which the republic is indebted for a career more rapid and more glorious than any that has hitherto marked the march of civilization and civil liberty."

"You have doubtless observed that a great effort is being made to give currency to the impression that the opinion and sentiments advanced by yourself find nothing like a general response in New England. I do not believe the fact to be so in this State. Our people set a value upon the Union which language cannot express; they look for a compromise—expect a compromise, conceived in a spirit of justice and patriotism, firmly and manfully."

More recently, Gen. Pierce, has defined his position on the compromise, with unequivocal exactness. In a letter dated Tremont House, Boston, May 29, 1852, and addressed to Major Lally, of Virginia, he uses the following emphatic language:

"If the compromise measures are not to be substantially and firmly maintained, the plain rights guaranteed by the constitution will be trampled in the dust. What difference can it make to you or me whether the outrage shall seem to fall on South Carolina, or Maine, or New Hampshire? Are not the rights of each equally dear to us all? I will never yield to a craven spirit that, from considerations of policy, will endanger the Union. Entertaining these views, the action of the convention must, in my judgment, be vital. If we of the North, who have stood by the constitutional rights of the South, are to be abandoned to any timeserving policy, the hopes of the democracy and of the Union must sink together. As I have told you, my name will not be before the convention, but I cannot help feeling that what is there to be done, will be important beyond men and parties—transcendently important to the hopes of democracy, progress and public liberty."

The sentiments of the letter from which the above is extracted, had much weight in securing the nomination of Gen. Pierce by the democratic convention. That body wisely concluded that a man of such national sentiments, and whose present opinions were so patriotic, was a man fit to administer the affairs of the government, and who could give peace and quiet to the country. That the entire party has heartily approved of the selection, is manifest from the burst of enthusiasm with which it has everywhere been received. Even those who had the strongest preferences for other men; agree that no selection could have been more judicious in itself, or better calculated to harmonize and unite the entire party of the nation.

Before closing this brief and imperfect notice of Gen. Pierce's civil life and opinions, we will put to rest a charge that has been trumpeted against him in certain localities, for the most unworthy purpose—that of prejudicing a particular class of our citizens in opposition to him. The charge is, that Gen. Pierce has approved the clause in the constitution of New Hampshire excluding Roman Catholics from office. The charge has no other foundation in fact, and the proof of its entire falsity will, we trust, put the people on their guard against similar fabrications. The Hon. Gen. M. Dallas, in a speech delivered at a ratification meeting in Philadelphia, on the 7th of June, referred to this charge, and put a most complete extinguisher upon it. He said:

"I have heard it intimated, to-day, for the first time, that Franklin Pierce had been the while the constitution of New Hampshire was in process of amendment, joined in declaring and retaining the proscription feature it contained against Roman Catholics. Now this is a weak invention of an already frightened enemy—it deserves to be nailed to the counter as spurious and base—and I hope, by a simple statement, to crush it at once and forever. It is true that

the Constitution of New Hampshire was disgraced by an intolerant and intolerably odious provision, commonly called 'The Catholic Test,' which rendered Catholics ineligible to the Legislature and to the office of Governor."

But it is equally true that the most strenuous exertions were repeatedly made by the Democracy, perseveringly led by two of her brightest stars, Levi Woodbury and Franklin Pierce, to expunge an exemption to common right so utterly inconsistent with the creed and character of sound Republicanism. Twice did these just and generous champions of civil and religious liberty succeed in obtaining from a Convention, called at their instance and for that very purpose, an abolition of this Test, and twice, (as the Constitution permitted no change of its provisions, unless sanctioned by two-thirds of the votes of the people,) were they defeated by the opposition of combined whigs and Abolitionists at the polls."

Having reviewed the distinguished services of Gen. Pierce in civil life, we now come to a consideration of his military claims. In all free governments the volunteer defenders of the Republic have ever held a high place in the affections of their countrymen, and in none have a higher estimate been placed upon such military services than in our own. The hearts of the people instinctively warm towards those who have periled their lives in defence of their native land, or in vindication of the national honor. Peculiarly and justly strong is this feeling for the volunteer soldier, who leaves the emoluments of the domestic fireside and the emolument of a lucrative profession, and suspending the ordinary avocations of life rush into the strife, indifferent to every feeling except that of patriotism. While no one honors the regular army more than we do, or is more willing to award it the merited gallantry it deserves, yet the sacrifices made by it cannot fairly be considered as commensurate with those made by the volunteer. The regular army is a profession. The members of it have adopted it as a means of livelihood. They discharge the duties of it precisely as a man would discharge the duties of any other pursuit. Their compensation is full and amply sufficient for all the reasonable wants of our nature. Unless in times of war, the duties of the regular soldier or officer are easy and unaccompanied with danger or particular hardship. Even war itself is not without its benefits, as it opens the path to distinction and permanent promotion. While, therefore, we accord all proper honor to the regular soldier, we are unwilling to admit that he is entitled to as high praise as the volunteer, who breaking up his regular pursuit engages in the military service of his country, at the sacrifice of his business no less than the peril of his life.

During the war of 1812, Franklin Pierce was a boy too young to engage in the conflict. At the breaking out of the Mexican war he was, however, in the prime of life. He had held the office of member of the Legislature, member of Congress, and member of the United States Senate. The latter high position he had voluntarily resigned because of his moderate pecuniary circumstances, which did not permit him to remain in public life without disregard of the interests of his wife and children. For the same reason, he declined a position in President Polk's cabinet, and also a foreign mission. Notwithstanding these repeated declinations of high civil offices, upon the first call made upon New Hampshire for troops he tendered his services to the government and enrolled his name as a PRIVATE. The moral spectacle of a man declining a position in the cabinet, and volunteering as a private in the ranks to fight Mexicans, is worthy the best days of our government and illustrative of the highest and purest patriotism. Such patriotism received however its reward, and President Polk gave him the commission of Colonel, and subsequently that of Brigadier General. In the latter capacity his services to the country as a military man were rendered. His commission was dated the 30th of March, 1847. On June 28th 1847 he arrived at Vera Cruz at the head of 2,500 men with orders to proceed on to Puebla and join General Scott, who was at that waiting reinforcements preparatory to his descent upon the valley. On the voyage from New Point to Vera Cruz, his conduct to the soldiers on board of the vessel in which he sailed is represented to have been kind in the extreme—carrying them water with his own hands and attending to the sick as if they had been his own children. Arrived at Vera Cruz he scarcely tarried in that stronghold, but hurried on to join Scott. At this time the guerrillas were very strong on the road, and occupying as they did the strongest points their dislodgement was somewhat difficult and accompanied with considerable danger. Gen. Pierce, however, pushed on and joined Scott in July at Puebla. During his march he had some four or five engagements with the guerrillas in all of which he exhibited qualities of military talent and daring courage. In one of them his hat was shot through twice. Arrived at Puebla, the brigade he had led through these difficulties and dangers, was merged in the general mass of Scott's army and with that moved on to the city. Being a junior Brigadier General, he had no independent command, but was under Shields. We hear no more of him until the battle of Contreras, in which he led his brigade into the thickest of the fight, and acted in such a way as to elicit from Gen. Scott the warmest praises for his gallantry and general good conduct. In this engagement, while charging with his troops his horse fell under him, almost crushing his knee bone. Though suffering intense pain he continued on the field through the action. That night he suffered severely, and on the next day the surgeon ordered him not to go into the battle. His chivalric spirit could not obey even professional advice, and the battle of Churubusco the same day saw him leading his squadron, until fainting from exhaustion he fell from his horse.

No better testimony of his valor and intelligence is wanting than is found in the conduct of Gen. Scott. After the battle of Churubusco, the Mexicans proposed an armistice. Gen. Pierce was selected by Scott as one of the American commissioners to treat with the Mexican officers. Generals Quitman and Ferrier Smith were associated with him in the commission, whose names are sufficient guarantee that the position was one given only to eminent service. The injury suffered by Gen. Pierce in the battle of Contreras, prevented him from participating as

actively in the subsequent engagements as his own daring spirit would have wished. He had, however, won for himself a permanent place in the military history of the country and indicated his descent from a revolutionary lineage. He returned to the United States beloved by his troops, and once more embraced the pursuits of life which he had abandoned only to serve his country in the tented field. In that retirement he has remained until now, when the unsolicited, and in fact declined call, of his country again demands his services.

GEN. SCOTT—GEN. JACKSON—GOV. CLINTON.

In April, 1817, Gen. Jackson, the commander of the Southern Division of the U. S. Army, issued an order concerning the government of that division. This order was spoken of by Gen. Scott by terms highly insulting to a brother officer, with whom he had been on terms of intimacy. Of the language of Gen. Scott, Gen. Jackson was informed by an anonymous letter from New York, and he immediately made a respectful call upon Gen. Scott for an explanation. The reply of Gen. Scott, as appeared from the annexed letter, was insulting and opprobrious. This letter we have never seen in print, but to it Gen. Jackson replied as follows:

GEN. JACKSON TO GEN. SCOTT.
Head Quarters, Division of the South.
NASHVILLE, Dec. 3, 1817.

SIR:—I have been absent from this place a considerable time, rendering the last friendly office I could, to a particular friend, whose eyes I closed on the 29th ult. Owing to this, your letter of the 4th October was not received until the last instant.

Upon the receipt of the anonymous communication from New York, I hastened to lay it before you; that course was suggested to me by the respect I felt for you as a soldier, and that you might have it in your power to answer how far you had been guilty of so base and inexcusable conduct. Independent of the services you had rendered your country, the circumstances of your wearing the badge and insignia of a soldier, led me to the conclusion that I was addressing a gentleman. With those feelings you were written to, and had an idea, been for a moment entertained that you could have descended from the high and dignified character of a major general of the army of the United States, and used a language so opprobrious and insolent as you have done, rest assured I should have viewed you as rather too contemptible to have held any converse with you on the subject. If you have lived in the world thus long in the entire ignorance of the obligations and duties which honor impose, you are indeed past the time of hearing, and surely he must be ignorant of them, who seems so little to understand their influence.

Pray sir, does your recollection serve, in what that school of philosophy you were taught; that to a letter inquiring into the nature of a supposed injury, and clothed in language decorous and unexceptionable, an answer should be given, couched in pompous insolence and bullying expression? I had hoped that what was charged upon you by my anonymous correspondent, was unfounded; I had hoped so from the belief that Gen. Scott was a soldier and a gentleman, but when I see those statements doubly confirmed by his own words, it becomes a matter of inquiry how far a man of honorable feeling can reconcile them to himself, or longer set up a claim to that character. Are you ignorant, sir, that had my order, at which your reflex judgement is so extremely touched, been made the subject of inquiry, you might from your standing, not your character, been constituted one of my judges? How very improper, then, was it, thus situated, and without a knowledge of any of the attendant circumstances, for you to have prejudged the whole matter. This at different times and in the circle of your friends, you could do; and yet had I been arraigned, and you detailed as one of my judges, with the designs of an assassin lurking under a fair exterior, you would have approached the holy sanctuary of justice! Is conduct like this congenial with that high sense of dignity which should be seated in a soldier's bosom? Is it due from a brother officer to assail in the dark the reputation of another, and stab him at a moment when he cannot expect it? I might insult an honorable man with questions such as these, but shall not expect that they will harrow up one who must be dead to all those feelings which are characteristics of a gentleman.

In terms as polite as I was capable of noting, I asked you if my informant had stated truly, if you were the author of the publication and remarks charged against you and to what extent; a reference to your letter, without any comment of mine, will inform how far you have pursued a similar course—how little of the gentleman, and how much of the beating bully you have manifested. If nothing else would, the epaulet which grace your shoulders, should have dictated a different course, and have admonished you that however small may have been your respect for another, respect for yourself should have taught you the necessity of replying, at least mildly, to the inquiries I suggested; and more especially should you have done this, when your own constructions must have fixed you as guilty of the abominable crime of detraction—of slandering, and behind his back, a brother officer. But not content with answering to what was proposed, your overweening vanity has led you to make an offering of your advice.

Believe me, sir, it is not in my power to render you my thanks; I think too highly of myself to suppose that I stand at all in need of your acknowledgments; and too lightly of you to appreciate them as useful. For good advice I am always thankful; but never fail to spurn it when I know it to flow from an incompetent and corrupt source; the best place to look for virtue or any thing that leads to virtue. My notions, sir, are not those now taught in modern schools, and in fashionable high life; they were imbued in ancient days, and hitherto have, and yet bear me to the conclusion that he who can wantonly outrage the feelings of another—who without cause, can extend injury where none is done, is capable of any crime, however detestable in its nature, and will not fail to commit it, whenever it may be imposed by necessity.

I shall not stop to a justification of my order